

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/595,227	06/16/2000	MINGMING FANG	99154X204201	2766
	590 09/06/2002			
PHYLLIS T. TURNER-BRIM, ESQ., LAW DEPARTMENT			EXAMINER	
CABOT MICROELECTRONICS CO 870 NORTH COMMONS DRIVE AURORA, IL 60504		DRPORATION	SHAKERI, HADI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3723	#14
			DATE MAILED: 09/06/2002	,,,,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

±	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/595,227	FANG ET AL.				
,	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Hadi Shakeri	3723				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 19 August 2002 FAILS TO PLACE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearamentation (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this appliced in the control of	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing of the period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moleanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. S  136(a) and the appropriate ext fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered by	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further		see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note be	•					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	simplifying the			
(d)  they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clair	ns.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does NC	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	re newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	•					
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: 1-23.						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. $\square$ The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	proved by the Exam	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)					
10. Other:						



The arguments regarding the rejections under 35USC 103(a) over Huynh et al. in view of Jamens et al. have been considered but they are not persuasive. As indicated in the Final Rejection, paragraph No. 6, the arguments regarding "motivation to combine", "references not teaching or suggesting all the claim limitations" and "reasonable expectation of success or routine optimization " were discussed. It is noted that James et al. teaches the use of the polishing system for polishing both a memory disk or a semiconductor and that polishing a semiconductor is not patenably distinct from polishing a memory disk.

Joseph J. Hail, III
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 3700

Charles Hailes